

## REMARKS

### *The Present Invention*

The present invention pertains to a method of inhibiting binding of a chaperone protein with its client protein or client polypeptide by contacting a chaperone protein with a coumarin or a coumarin derivative, wherein the chaperone protein is heat shock protein (Hsp) 90.

### *The Pending Claims*

Claims 1, 3-17, and 22 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3-17, and 22 are directed to a method of inhibiting a chaperone protein with its client protein or client polypeptide by contacting a chaperone protein with a coumarin or a coumarin derivative, wherein the chaperone protein is Hsp90.

### *The Amendments to the Claims*

The subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 2 has been canceled. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment.

### *Summary of the Office Action*

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-17, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for alleged lack of enablement. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### *Discussion of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph*

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-17, and 22 have been rejected as allegedly not being enabled for a method of inhibiting the binding of a chaperone protein with its client protein by contacting a chaperone protein other than Hsp90 with a coumarin or a coumarin derivative. Solely in an effort to advance prosecution of the instant application and not in acquiescence of the rejection, the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites that the chaperone protein of the claimed method is Hsp90. The instant specification fully enables the method of amended claim 1, as well as the method of claims 3-6, 8-17, and 22 dependent thereon. Indeed, canceled claim 2 was not rejected by the Office for lack of enablement. Accordingly, amended claim 1, as well as claims 3-6, 8-17, and 22 dependent thereon, is enabled by the instant application, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In re Appln. of Marcu et al.  
Application No. 09/936,449

*Conclusion*

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



David J. Schoen, Reg. No. 41,294  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: November 22, 2004